



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for the damages paid the employee. *Hood & Sons v. Maryland Casualty Co.*, 206 Mass. 223. See NOTES, p. 221.

INSURANCE — RIGHTS OF BENEFICIARY — MURDER OF INSURED BY BENEFICIARY. — After murdering the insured, the beneficiary of a life insurance contract sought to recover from the insurer the amount of the policy. *Held*, that he cannot recover. *Filmore v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 92 N. E. 26 (Ohio).

After the murder of the insured by the beneficiary the insurance company admitted liability upon the policy. The administrator of the insured and the administrator of the beneficiary each claimed the proceeds. *Held*, that the administrator of the insured is entitled to recover. *Anderson v. Life Insurance Co. of Virginia*, 67 S. E. 53 (N. C.). See NOTES, p. 227.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE — WHAT CONSTITUTES INTERSTATE COMMERCE — FOREIGN CORPORATION PREPARING OUTSIDE STATE AND EXHIBITING IN IT ADVERTISEMENT OF LOCAL BUSINESS. — A foreign corporation contracted with a resident of Michigan to prepare and exhibit for three years in Michigan a sign, bearing an advertisement of the resident's business. The sign was to be prepared outside the state. In an action by the corporation for the sum due it on the contract after two years' exhibition, the defendant showed that the plaintiff had not fulfilled the requirements for doing business laid down by a statute which did not apply to interstate commerce. *Held*, that the transaction does not constitute interstate commerce. *Imperial Curtain Co. v. Jacob*, 127 N. W. 772 (Mich.). See NOTES, p. 230.

JUDGMENTS — COLLATERAL ATTACK — PUNISHMENT FOR CONTEMPT. — In contempt proceedings, the defendant contended that there were not sufficient grounds for granting the order which he had disobeyed. *Held*, that this defense is invalid. *Starkweather v. Williams*, 76 Atl. 662 (R. I.).

If a decree is utterly void, the party affected is justified in disregarding it, and may attack its validity when prosecuted for contempt. *Dodd v. Una*, 40 N. J. Eq. 672. A decree may be void because the court has no jurisdiction over the parties or subject matter. *In re Sawyer*, 124 U. S. 200. Or, a court having authority to hear the cause may grant relief of a kind that lies without its jurisdiction. *McHenry v. State*, 91 Miss. 562. When, however, the court has jurisdiction, the fact that an order was erroneously or improvidently issued does not justify disobedience. The proper remedy is an appeal on the merits. *Erie Ry. Co. v. Ramsey*, 45 N. Y. 637; *Clark v. Burke*, 163 Ill. 334.

LANDLORD AND TENANT — ASSIGNMENT AND SUBLETTING — SUB-LESSEE'S BREACH OF COVENANT TO REPAIR: MEASURE OF DAMAGES. — In 1855, A leased premises for ninety-nine years to B, who covenanted to repair. In 1887 B sublet to C, who covenanted to repair in the same terms as those of the head lease. In 1908 A sued B for failure to repair, and B, in addition to damages, paid a fine and costs to avoid a forfeiture. B thereupon sued C on his covenant, and sought to include in his damages the costs of the former action. *Held*, that he cannot recover the costs. *Clare v. Dobson*, *London Times*, Oct. 21, 1910, p. 3 (K. B. D.).

If C's covenant were to perform the covenant in the head lease, it would be a covenant of indemnity and B's costs would be recoverable. *Hornby v. Cardwell*, 8 Q. B. D. 329. But a covenant by a sub-lessee to repair, although in the terms of the lessee's covenant, is not a covenant of indemnity. *Pontifex v. Foord*, 12 Q. B. D. 152. The rule of damages, however, in breach of contract covers damages which might reasonably have been contemplated by both parties when the contract was made. *Hadley v. Baxendale*, 9 Exch. 341. Under